



THE
PRIMITIVE CHURCHMAN:

OR,

REASONS

WHY I AM NOT AN EPISCOPALIAN.

Second Edition.

PHILADELPHIA:
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
118 ARCH STREET.
1851.

“The right disposition of mind is, that which desires earnestly “The Truth!” “The Truth!” in whatever manner it may come to us. Not that the manner of its being conveyed is quite indifferent; far from it; but “The Truth,” howsoever it come, has its own intrinsic—eternal value. And what a fool I am, if I will not take it, and apply it to its use, just because the manner of its coming to me has not pleased me!”

FOSTER.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1851, by the
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, in
and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

~~~~~  
STEREOTYPED BY GEORGE CHARLES.

PRINTED BY KING & BAIRD.  
~~~~~

CONTENTS.

REASON I.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH RETAINS SOME OF THE VITAL ROOTS OF ROMANISM.....	6
--	---

REASON II.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH HAS ABOLISHED THE PRIMI- TIVE POPULAR GOVERNMENT.....	12
---	----

REASON III.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH HAS CHANGED THE PRIMI- TIVE CHURCH OFFICERS.....	16
--	----

REASON IV.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH UNDULY EXALTS THE AU- THORITY OF THE FATHERS.....	28
---	----

REASON V.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH MAKES UNSCRIPTURAL PRE- TENSIONS.....	40
---	----

REASON VI.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH IS NOW IN EXISTENCE WITH LEGITIMATE CLAIMS.....	44
---	----

PREFACE.

To all who do not love "*a Church*" better than they love *Christ*—and are willing to receive the truth in the love of it—this Tract is inscribed. As an apology for writing it (a work but little congenial to his feelings,) the author would state that, besides the sectarian book styled "A Walk about Zion," a pamphlet designed not to make people Christians but "Episcopalians," has been circulated most industriously among his parishioners.

Without saying any thing of the unkindness with which these productions assail all other denominations, and the arrogance which puts forth claims that are a speculation on the ignorance of readers, I shall in a few words give the reasons why I am not, and cannot be an Episcopalian; much as I love and revere many who belong to that sect, which rather invidiously seeks to monopolize the word "Church."

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCHMAN:

OR,

REASONS WHY I AM NOT AN EPISCOPALIAN.

IT is of most solemn importance to every man what Church he joins, since by that act he throws all his influence in favor of her doctrines and practices, and against those Churches which differ from her. For this step, therefore, we must give account to God. And, while I yield to none in esteem for many in the Episcopal Church, and although I admire the beauty of her liturgies as I do of other fine compositions, I dare not unite myself with that Church, and for several reasons:—

REASON I.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH RETAINS SOME OF THE
VITAL ROOTS OF ROMANISM.

I cannot be an Episcopalian, (and if there were no other reasons this would be enough,) *because the Episcopal Church has brought out with her from the Roman, and perpetuates practices and doctrines repugnant to Scripture and to common sense.* And, in proof of this, I ask the reader only to take the book of Common Prayer, and turn to the chapter on the Baptism of Infants, and decide for himself.

1. First, see this—"There shall be for every male child to be baptized, when they can be had, two God-fathers and one God-mother; and for every female, one God-father and two God-mothers." Now, is there a pretence of reason or Scripture for such a practice? Is it not an invention of man?

2. These sponsors are often unconverted and wicked people; but I do not dwell on this, because the almost incredible part of the whole

affair is, *that the Rubric considers the questions as actually put to the child, and answered by the child!* The Minister says to the sponsor, “*Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?*” The sponsor replies, “*That is my desire.*” Hearing this, you conclude, of course, that he is the candidate, and “desires,” and is about to receive, baptism. In this, however, you only betray your simplicity. The man who says “that is my desire,” has no such desire at all. It was the infant who spoke, and the Minister accordingly pours water, not on the sponsor, but the child! In the Church of Rome, Augustine gives us the form invented, and which, like the form before us, was a pious artifice to meet the plain requirement of the Bible, that repentance and faith must precede baptism. The Roman formulary was thus:—“Doth this child believe in God? Doth he turn to God?” The framers of the Prayer Book seem to have felt that this was too glaring. They have therefore introduced a strange medley; at first making the sponsor renounce for the child; and then getting back into the Romish fiction that it is the child itself that answers. I quote the whole.

Minister. Dost thou, in the name of this child, renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh; so that thou wilt not follow, nor be led by them?

Answer. I renounce them all; and by God's help, will endeavor not to follow, nor be led by them. (THIS IS "IN THE NAME OF THE CHILD.")

Minister. Dost thou believe all the articles of the Christian Faith, as contained in the Apostles' Creed?

Answer. I do. (*Is this "in the name of the child" too?—i. e. "in the name of this child, I do believe?"*)

Minister. Wilt thou be baptized in this Faith?

Answer. That is my desire. (*Here we have the child!*)

Minister. Wilt thou then obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?

Answer. I will, by God's help." (*Who will?*)

3. The Episcopal Church does teach the

dangerous heresy of Baptismal Regeneration. I cheerfully admit, that her evangelical Ministers reject this doctrine, for when these very children, who have been pronounced “regenerated,” grow to years of discretion, they are exhorted as to the necessity of regeneration; and, indeed, we hear them spoken of as being then regenerated, and joining the Church. But this only proves that such Ministers should leave that Church. For what contradiction! A. B., when six months old, is pronounced “*regenerated by the Holy Spirit, made God’s own child by adoption, and incorporated into God’s Holy Church;*” and yet, some years afterwards, this very child is told he must be regenerated! And the Minister very gravely tells you, when A. B. is thirty years old, that he is regenerated and has joined the Church. What! regenerated twice? And what Church has he joined—for he has been for thirty years “incorporated into God’s Holy Church?” That my readers may see that this is the doctrine of the Episcopal Church, although many who are allured there know it not and deny it, I here quote her own language, which, of course, all her members declare to be their creed:—

“Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, *that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ’s Church*, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits, and with one accord make our prayers unto him, that this child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning!!

“We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that *it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy Holy Church*. And humbly we beseech thee to grant, that he, *being dead unto sin and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in his death*, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that *as he is made partaker of the death of thy Son*, he may also be partaker of his resurrection; so that finally, with the residue of thy holy Church, he may be an inheritor of thine everlasting kingdom, through Christ our Lord. Amen.”

And the child is afterwards confirmed in this doctrine, and made (O parents, will you thus nourish in your offspring a fatal delusion?) to repeat it in the Catechism.

“ *Question.* What is your name ?

Answer. N. or M.

Question. Who gave you this name ?

Answer. My sponsors in baptism ; *wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.*”

Now reader, in a few days you and I will stand at the bar of God—that God who says, “If any man shall add unto these things, I will add unto him the plagues that are written in this book : And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, I will take away his part out of the book of life ;” (a)—and I ask, will you, can you lend all your authority to these doctrines and practices, and against the Churches which are struggling for the truths of the Gospel.*

(a) Rev. xxii : 18, 19.

* With what grace can Episcopalians say, that Baptists make too much of Baptism ? Does any Baptist hold doctrines like these ? Do they not require a profession of faith and repentance before Baptism ? And are they not most strict in rejecting candidates who ascribe to water any saving virtue ?

REASON II.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH HAS ABOLISHED THE
PRIMITIVE POPULAR GOVERNMENT.

I cannot be an Episcopalian, because the Episcopal Church has *entirely abolished the popular form of government instituted by Christ and his Apostles and introduced one which is aristocratical*. This subject has been placed in such a light by Neander, and Coleman, and Barnes, in their late works, that if a candid person will read those authors, he must esteem this second reason quite as strong as the first. To defend their Church organization, Episcopal writers sometimes pretend that the Church in England was founded in the time of the Apostles, and even that Paul was the founder! To those acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles, giving the history of Paul, this last claim will serve as a sample of the rest. Every body knows that the Church of England commenced in the reign of King Henry VIII, (A. D. 1533,) and owed its origin

to the worst passions of a Monarch who opposed the Reformation, and wrote against it, and only left the Church of Rome because the Pope righteously refused him a divorce. Suppose, however, the Apostles had planted Churches in Great Britain, this would only put them on the same footing with those at Rome and Corinth, &c., and it is certain the Churches organized at those places were not Episcopal; they were independent popular assemblies, vested with rights which the Bishops and Clergy of the Episcopal Church arrogate to themselves.

1. The Apostolic Churches exercised, themselves, the power of discipline—thus securing to each member the right of trial by his peers; and even inspired Apostles did not venture to trench upon this prerogative. The language of the Saviour is, “If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, *tell it unto the Church*; but if he *neglect to hear the Church*, let him

be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." (a) The language of the Holy Ghost to the Churches, is, "If any man obey not our word by this Epistle, note that man, and have no company with him that he may be ashamed." (b) "Do not ye" (the Church,) "judge them that are within? (members of the Church,) therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." (c) "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, *when ye are gathered together*, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." (d) "Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, *which was inflicted of many*, (the majority,) so that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such an one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow." (e) "It is manifest," as Neander remarks, "that the rule is here set forth, requiring the action of the Church in all such concerns of general interest." (f) But in the Episcopal Church the

(a) Matt. xviii. 15-17. (b) 2 Thess. iii. 14. (c) 1 Cor. v. 12, 13. (d) 1 Cor. v. 4, 5. (e) 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7. (f) Allgem. Gesch., 1. p. 292. Comp. p. 350. Apost. Kirch., 1. pp. 319, 320.

whole power over all the Churches in a Diocese, is usurped by one man, who is called the Bishop, and is sole arbiter, though often a stranger. The course there is, "*tell it to the Bishop!*" and he decides without regard to the Church.

2. The entire government of the Apostolic Churches was popular. The members of each Church enacted all their rules, and managed all their affairs by suffrage. "With them resided the power of enacting laws, as also of adopting or rejecting whatever might be proposed in the general assemblies, and of expelling and again receiving into communion, any depraved or unworthy members. In a word, nothing whatever, of any moment, could be determined on, or carried into effect, without their knowledge and concurrence." (*g*) And this is admitted by the most learned Episcopalians, as Riddle, (*h*) Bingham, (*i*) Whatly, (*j*) and others. I need not say that the members of Episcopal Churches are entirely deprived of this right by the priesthood.

(*g*) Mosheim, De Rebus Christ., Saec. 1, § 45. (*h*) Chron. 2nd Cen. (*i*) B. 16. (*j*) Kingdom of Christ.

REASON III.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH HAS CHANGED THE
PRIMITIVE CHURCH OFFICERS.

I am not an Episcopalian, *because the Church, as instituted by the authority of the New Testament, had only two classes of officers, Presbyters, (viz: Elders,) and Deacons; and the third class, styled in England Lord Bishops, and in this country misnamed Bishops, is the creation of spiritual ambition, and condemned both by the spirit and letter of the Bible.*

1. With reference to Presbyters (named also according to the work to which they devoted themselves, Pastors, or Teachers, or Overseers) I will only call the reader's attention to the fact, admitted by Episcopalians, that whenever the term Bishop occurs in the New Testament, it describes the Presbyter, and never, in one instance, has the meaning which is now attached to it, viz: Prelate. Even Dr. Onderdonk says, "that name (bishop) is there, (i. e. in the New Testament,) given to the

middle order or Presbyters; and all that we read in the New Testament concerning 'Bishops' (including of course the words 'overseers,' and oversight,' which have the same derivation;) is to be regarded as pertaining to that middle grade. It was after the Apostolic age, that the name 'Bishop' was taken from the second order, and appropriated to the first." (*k*)

2. As to Deacons, I refer the reader to Acts vi., when they were first chosen, their election being by "the multitude of disciples," and their office the supervision of the temporal affairs of the Church. In 1 Tim. iii., the Holy Ghost gives the qualifications necessary for the officers of the Christian Church, viz: of Bishops, (i. e. pastors,) and Deacons, and while the former are required to be "apt to teach," no such talent is demanded of the latter. We find, too, in Rom. xvi. 1, that women (who are forbidden to teach, 1 Tim. ii. 12) were Deacons; the word "servant of the Church" being "Diakonos," "Deacon." All this is violated in the Episcopal Church; the Deacons are not chosen by the disciples, and as the Presbyters in their ambition became Prelates,

the Deacons moved up too, and became an inferior order of Presbyters.

3. The great assumption of Episcopacy, however, rests on the order of Prelates; and here I will repeat what Episcopal Churchmen are compelled to admit, and what Bishop Onderdonk, the great champion of his order, confesses, "*that it was after the Apostolic age that the name 'Bishop' was taken from the second order, and appropriated to the first.*" (l) My reader will not expect me to do more than indicate one or two of the arguments by which this innovation of Romanism, still persisted in by the Episcopal Church, has again and again been overthrown.

(1.) In the first place, then, we see Episcopalians confessing *that they have perverted the use of the term "Bishop!"* Now why this? Plainly, because the Prelatical office has no existence in the Bible, or else it would have had a name. We are sometimes gravely told that Bishops are successors of the Apostles. Well why not, then, call them Apostles? Who but perceives that such a title would at once have exposed the arrogance of the thing, and that

(l) Ond. Epis. p. 12.

the word Bishop has been purloined only for a disguise, in which spiritual usurpation may masquerade and elude detection?

(2.) In 1 Tim. iii., God gives the perfect canon of Scripture, as to the qualification of permanent officers for the Church, and there are only two, viz: Bishops (i. e. Pastors,) and Deacons. There is not an intimation of this third and lordly order. It is, therefore, not only without an appellation in the Bible, but without any required qualifications! It was neither named nor contemplated by the Holy Ghost.

(3.) Every candid reader of the Bible perceives that the Apostles were chosen for a special and temporary purpose, and the peculiarity of their office is expressly specified. They were chosen: 1st, to be with Christ, and to be endowed with miraculous powers, which they also conferred on others—"And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have *power to heal sickness, and to cast out devils.*"(m) 2nd, to be eye-witnesses of the resurrection—"Wherefore of these men which

(m) Mark iii. 14, 15.

have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be *a witness with us of his resurrection.*” “This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are *witnesses.*” (n) 3rd, to be with the Saviour after his resurrection—“Him hath God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did *eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.*” (o) And hence Paul rests his title to Apostleship on this very fact—“Am I not an Apostle, am I not free, *have I not seen the Lord.*” (p) Will it be pretended that Episcopal Prelates are Apostles after this? Their fear of taking the name is an acknowledgement that they feel the claim to be utterly indefensible. Whately, an Archbishop, (here is another rank higher than Bishop!) frankly declares that “Successors, in the apostolic office, the Apostles have none. As witnesses of the resurrection—as dispensers of miraculous gifts

(n) Acts i. 21, 22, also ii. 32. (o) Acts x. 40, 41
 (p) 1 Cor. ix. 1.

—as inspired oracles of divine revelation, they have no successors. But as members—as ministers—as governors of Christian communities, their successors are the regularly admitted members—the lawfully ordained ministers—the regular and recognized governors, of a regularly subsisting Christian Church.” (q)

(4.) But even the twelve Apostles never usurped the powers now arrogated by diocesan Bishops. We have seen already that the right to choose officers (and even an Apostle, Acts i.) was in the popular body. We have shown that the prerogatives of discipline and government were also in the body. The Apostles never put forward the proud claims of Episcopal Bishops, as to these matters; nor as to others.

For example: did Jesus Christ institute any other rites than Baptism and the Supper? Whence then the ordinance of *confirmation*? Both the Old and New Testaments speak of “laying on of hands.” “Thus Jacob in blessing the sons of Joseph, laid his hands upon their heads.” So, Jesus “took young children in his arms and blessed them, laying his hands

upon them." And Paul and Barnabas were dismissed, to go on their missionary tour, with the blessing of the brethren at Antioch, "by the laying on of hands," (Acts xiii. 3,) although they had long been engaged in ministerial duties. But to create an ordinance out of this is palpable contrivance to give importance to the Bishop. Episcopalians themselves differ as to what this apochryphal ceremony means. If it be only a mode of pronouncing a benediction, or of admitting members to the church, adopted for expediency, no notice would be required of it, except to ask, why the Pastor may not perform the office? Episcopalians, however, maintain that there is Scriptural authority, and cite Acts viii. 14-17, and Acts xix. 1-7. But in these cases, visible miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost were imparted; and Bishops must show that these visible miraculous gifts are now imparted, or these texts prove nothing. Nor does Heb. vi. 1, 2, furnish evidence of anything except the imposition of hands in some cases, which no one denies, and which is now practised in all Churches. So, too, of superiority over other Presbyters: did the Apostles assert it? Just the reverse. Their

language is constantly that of men addressing equals; (1 Pet. v. i.) "Even the Apostles, though next to Christ himself, invested with the highest authority, assumed no superiority over the Presbyters, but treated them as brethren, and styled themselves fellow-presbyters, thus recognizing them as associates in office." (r)

And so again as to *ordination*: while the Apostles, as Presbyters, ordained, they allowed the same power to other Presbyters. Episcopalians deny this right to any Presbyters but the unauthorized order of Prelates; it is, therefore, their duty to establish by positive proof this high-handed exclusiveness. The truth, however, is, that if Episcopal ordination be valid at all, it is only as an ordination by Presbyters. The Bishop is only a Presbyter, and ordination in the New Testament was by a Presbytery, viz: a council of Presbyters, and of this 1 Tim. iv. 14, is conclusive: "*Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.*" This is exactly the account of an ordination now in Presbyterian, Congregational, or Baptist Churches. Episcopalians say

(r) Apostol. Christengemeinen. Halberstadt, 1819.

the Apostles were distinguished from the Elders by the power to ordain, and yet Jesus never intimates this as part of their duties, although he gives them minute directions; nor when the Seventy were sent forth, was any such function assigned them; nor is it pretended that the Apostles ever declared this work to belong to their office. In cases, in fact, of some most eminent Preachers mentioned in the Bible, it is certain the Apostles never laid hands on them at all. For example, who ordained Apollos? (Acts xviii. 24-27.) And so, too, Paul himself, what apostolic ordination had he? As soon as converted he began to "*preach Christ straightway.*" (Acts ix. 20) "What, then, is Ordination? The answer is, a decent and becoming solemnity, adopted from the Jewish customs by the primitive Church, significant of the separation of an individual to some specific appointment in the Christian Ministry, and constituting both a recognition on the part of the officiating Presbyters of the Ministerial character of the person appointed, and a desirable sanction of the proceedings of the Church. It is, however, something more than a mere circumstance, the imposition of hands being

designed to express that fervent benediction which accompanied the ceremony, and which constitutes the true spirit of the rite. To an occasion which, when the awful responsibility of the pastoral charge is adequately felt, imparts to the prayers and the affectionate aid of those who are fathers and brethren in the Ministry, a more special value, the sign and solemn act of benediction must appear peculiarly appropriate. This venerable ceremony may also be regarded as a sort of bond of fellowship among the Churches of Christ, a sign of unity, and an act of brotherhood." (s)

(5.) In fine, all the efforts of Episcopalians to find such an officer as their Prelate, in the Bible, are as fruitless as they would be to find archbishops, cardinals, and popes. Timothy was an evangelist in Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, just as now we have missionaries in foreign lands, to whom instructions are sent as to their course of action, and the regulation of Churches of native converts. To say they were prelatical Bishops, is not only to affirm the very thing which ought to be proved, but to repeat

(s) Cond. Prot. Non. Vol. i. p. 242.

what has over and over been disproved. (t) After all their labor and research, Episcopalians are reduced to the figment that the 'Angels' addressed in the letters to the seven Churches, must have been Prelates. But I cannot suppose it necessary to refute this. Where is the evidence? "How much," says Neander, "must we assume as already proved, which yet is entirely without evidence, in assigning to this early period, the rise of such a monarchical system of government, that the Bishop alone can be put in the place of the whole Church. In this phraseology I recognize rather a symbolical application of the idea of guardian angels, similar to that of the Ferver of the Persees, as a symbolical representation and image of the whole Church. Such a figurative representation corresponds well with the poetical and symbolical character of the book throughout. It is also expressly said that the address is to the whole body of the Churches." (u) And Stillingfleet, than whom an abler man, and one whose praise is higher in Episcopal Churches, is not to be found among the advocates of prelacy, says

(t) See Coleman and Barnes, *passim*. (u) Introduction to Coleman.

of these Angels: "If many things in the epistles be directed to the angels, but yet so as to concern the whole body, then, of necessity, the angel must be taken as the representative of the whole body; and then, why may not the word angel be taken by way of representation of the body itself, either of the whole Church, or, which is far more probable, of the consessors, or order of Presbyters, in that Church? We see what miserable, unaccountable arguments those are, which are brought for any kind of government, from metaphorical or ambiguous expressions, or names promiscuously used." (v) My reader will judge from this, what confidence to put in the bold, unscrupulous, unblushing statements hazarded on this point by the writer of the "Reasons for being an Episcopalian."

(v) Irenicum.

REASON IV.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH UNDULY EXALTS THE
AUTHORITY OF THE FATHERS.

To support errors clearly condemned by the Bible, it is customary with different denominations to cite the early 'Fathers,' as they are called. If the reader will peruse Taylor's 'Ancient Christianity,' written by an Episcopalian, he will be astonished at the respect hitherto paid to patristic authority. And if he have time to consult those 'Fathers' himself, he will find that there is scarcely an absurdity but may be defended by passages from them. On this subject there is an admirable article in the *Edinburg Review* for April, 1843. "We are convinced, (says the Review,) that nothing more is needed than the indiscriminate exposure of an impartial sample of the works of these unparalleled writers to the popular gaze, to obliterate that feeling of traditional reverence with which they are regarded. The drunken Helots never taught the Spartans a more

wholesome lesson of temperance, than the inimitable antics of these holy men would teach the present age, of the folly of deferring to them, as our spiritual guides; and still more of investing them, under any conditions, with the authority of Scripture." Even when John wrote the Revelation there were many corruptions to censure, as we find in the letters to the Churches in Asia; nay, in Paul's Epistles, mention is made of those who were seeking to advance their ambitious views by innovations in the Churches he had founded. It would, therefore, be no matter of surprise, if spiritual usurpations had begun in the very first century.

But in truth, the Episcopal clergy cannot obtain support for their encroachments, even from the early Fathers. The great bulwark of Episcopalians is Ignatius, as to whose Epistles, it is enough to remark, that they are pronounced by some most learned men, to be the fabrications of a later age; and incontestibly, they have been so interpolated as to be unworthy of any confidence. My readers know the weight of Milton's name on such a question, and hear what he says, after exposing the anachronisms and contradictions of the work:

“These, and other like passages, in abundance through all those short epistles, must either be adulterate, or else Ignatius was not Ignatius, nor a martyr, but most adulterate and corrupt himself. In the midst, therefore, of so many forgeries, where shall we fix, to dare say this is Ignatius? As for his style, who knows it, so disfigured and interrupted as it is, except they they think that where they meet with anything sound and orthodoxal, there they find Ignatius? And then they believe him, not for his own authority, but for a truth’s sake, which they derive from elsewhere. To what end, then, should they cite him as authentic for Episcopacy, when they cannot know what is authentic in him, but by the judgment which they brought with them, and not by any judgment which they might safely learn from him? How can they bring satisfaction from such an author, to whose very essence the reader must be fain to contribute his own understanding? Had God ever intended that we should have sought any part of useful instructions from Ignatius, doubtless he would not have so ill provided for our knowledge, as to send him to our hands in this broken and disjointed plight; and

if he intended no such thing, we do injuriously, in thinking to taste better the pure evangelic manna, by seasoning our mouth with the tainted scraps and fragments of an unknown table; and searching among the verminous and polluted rags, dropped overworn from the toiling shoulders of Time; with these deformedly to quilt and interlace the entire, the spotless and undecaying robe of Truth, the daughter, not of Time, but of Heaven, only bred up here below in Christian hearts between two grave and holy nurses, the doctrine and discipline of the gospel." (*w*)

Even, however, if these Epistles of Ignatius were genuine, they would not sustain the position of the Episcopal Church. Let the reader bear in mind the concessions given before, that the word 'Bishop' was at first never used to signify anything but a Pastor, and he will find the vaunted passages from Ignatius not at all implying any superiority of Bishops over Presbyters. Ignatius' Bishops were plainly Pastors of only one Church, and not lords over many; and there are now hundreds of Independent and Baptist Churches, to which a letter would

(*w*) Milton's Prel. Epis. P. W. vol. 1, pp. 79-80.

speak of the "Bishop" (or Pastor) and "Presbyters" (Ministers who are members, and, perhaps, assist the Pastor,) and "Deacons." If Ignatius' Epistles were not written in or near the first century, they are forgeries; if they were, they do not prove diocesan Episcopacy; for the word "Bishop" then meant only the overseer of a Church, as is admitted by the Prelatists themselves. Dr. Burton, regius Professor at Oxford, speaking of the beginning of the third century, says, "The term diocese, as has been observed in a former chapter, was of later introduction, and was borrowed by the Church from the civil constitution of the empire. At the period which we are now considering, a Bishop's diocese was more analogous to a modern parish, and such was the name which it bore. Each parish had, therefore, its own Bishop, with a varying number of Presbyters, or Priests and Deacons." (x) So Lord Chancellor King—"As for the word diocese, by which the Bishop's flock is now expressed, I do not remember that ever I found it used in this sense by any of the ancients. But there is another word still retained by us, by which

(x) Hist. Christ Ch. p. 179.

they frequently denominated the Bishop's cure; and that is parish." (y) "Every Bishop had but one congregation or Church. This is a remark which deserves your particular notice; as it regards an essential point in the constitution of the primitive Church, a point which is generally admitted by those who can make any pretensions to the knowledge of Christian antiquities. Now as one Bishop is invariably considered in the most ancient usage as having only one *Ekklesia*, (Church,) it is manifest that his inspection at first, was only one parish." (z) "Instead, therefore, of presiding over myriads of his fellow-men with authority, which even princes might envy, this your ancient Bishop was nothing more than an humble parish minister, having the charge of some little flock over whom he had been duly appointed an overseer in the service of the Chief Shepherd." (a).

If the reader will consult Coleman's masterly treatise he will find this matter forever settled, and he will see, too, that the only works of remote antiquity known to be genuine, disprove the claims of Episcopal Prelates. In fact,

(y) King's Prim. Ch., p. 15. (z) Camp. Lect., p. 105.
(a) Coleman, p. 203.

even as late as the fifth century, we find Jerome, who is admitted by Episcopalians to have been the most learned man of his age, attacking these haughty usurpations. He says "A Presbyter, therefore, is the same as a Bishop : and before there were, by the instigation of the devil, parties in religion, and it was said among different people, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the Churches were governed by the joint counsel of the Presbyters. But afterwards, when every one accounted those whom he baptized as belonging to himself and not to Christ, it was decreed throughout the whole world that one, chosen from among the Presbyters, should be put over the rest, and that the whole care of the Church should be committed to him, and the seeds of schism taken away. Should any one think that this is only my own private opinion, and not the doctrine of the Scriptures, let him read the words of the Apostle in his Epistle to the Philippians : "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons," &c. Philippi is a single city of Macedonia; and certainly in one city there could not be

several Bishops as they are now styled ; but as they, at that time, called the very same persons Bishops whom they called Presbyters, the Apostle has spoken without distinction of Bishops as Presbyters. Should this matter yet appear doubtful to any one, unless it be proved by an additional testimony, it is written in the Acts of the Apostles, that when Paul had come to Miletus, he sent to Ephesus and called the Presbyters of that Church, and among other things said to them, ‘ Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Spirit hath made you Bishops.’ Take particular notice, that calling the Presbyters of the single city of Ephesus, he afterwards names the same persons Bishops.” (b)

It is thus certain that all the passages quoted from Eusebius and others, have nothing to do with Prelates, the word Bishop meaning Pastor of a Church, and there being no such officer then as the modern Prelate.

And here I might stop. There is however such ignorance or disingenuousness, in the Tract called “Reasons why I am an Episcopalian,” that I must add a word more.

(b) Hieronymi Com. in Tit. i. 1.

This writer adduces Irenæus, (A. D. 180,) but either does not see, or by a play on words wishes to conceal from his readers the fact, that the very quotations show a Bishop to have been a Pastor over one Church. "Polycarp was Bishop over the Church in Smyrna," &c. Here the most illustrious man of his time is only Bishop of one Church; and I now add that Irenæus expressly styles Polycarp, afterwards, "that blessed Presbyter." (c) Again, the Tract writer cites this passage, "We can enumerate those who were constituted by the Apostles, Bishops in the Churches; their successors, also, even down to our time." But just before Irenæus styles these very Bishops, "Presbyters." (d) I have before me other quotations from Irenæus, but cannot suppose them necessary. The author of the Tract, next brings forward Tertullian, (A. D. 200,) and the reader will discover, at a glance, that he hopes to succeed by the usual jugglery, with the word Bishop, for the quotations recognize only the Bishop or Pastor of a Church. The Prelatical usurpation was clearly unknown even then; for

(c) Euseb., Eccl. Hist., Lib. 5, c. 20. (d) Irenæus, Adv. Haer., L. 3, c. 2.

take the strongest passage, viz: "Neither Presbyters, nor Deacons, might baptize without the Bishop's consent." Now, does this apply to Prelacy? Is it so that the Presbyters do not baptize without in each case obtaining the Prelate's consent? The passage plainly teaches, only what is now true in non-Episcopal Churches i. e., that the Pastor is the person to baptize, and others should not baptize candidates for admission into his Church without his consent. Tertullian stood "on the boundary between two different epochs," and in his writings we see the beginning of the Prelatical encroachments. He expressly tells us that one of the Presbyters was chosen President, and shows the origin of the order which now claims supremacy over other Presbyters and over hundreds of Churches, as if by warrant from God. This Presidency soon became a permanent office, and then the word Bishop was misapplied to cover it with a color of Scriptural authority.

Clement of Alexandria, (A. D. 220,) is our Tractarian's next authority. The reader will notice that he speaks of the Pastor, or Bishop of a Church, distinguishing him from a Presbyter, not as superior, but simply, as having

charge of a Church, and he shows fully elsewhere, that there were but two orders. He says expressly, "Just so in the Church, the Presbyters are entrusted with the dignified Ministry; the Deacons with the subordinate."(*e*)

He speaks, too, of the Presbyter chosen by the Presbytery to be the President. Soon after this, the title President was dropped and the word Bishop surreptitiously appropriated. The admitted import of the term Bishop need only be recollected, and the other passages cited in the so called Churchman's Tract, will demand no further comment from me. When we come to the fourth century, the Episcopal usurpations are established; but we find also most of the other corruptions of Romanism.

Had I time, I would gladly cite authors, whom Episcopalians carefully avoid. For example, Clement of Rome, is the first and most authentic of all the early Fathers. He wrote, A. D. 96, and he is express. He shows clearly that there were but two orders of officers. He says, "The Apostles preaching in countries and cities, appointed the first fruits of their labors, to be Bishops and Deacons, having

(*e*) Strom. Lib., 7. p. 700.

proved them by the Spirit.” (*f*) “Clement himself,” says Riddle, an Episcopalian, “was not even aware of the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters; terms which in fact he uses as synonymous.” (*g*)

(*f*) Epist. ad Cor. § 42, p. 57. (*g*) Christ. Antiq., p. 5.

REASON V.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH MAKES UNSCRIPTURAL
PRETENSIONS.

IT was the complaint of a distinguished writer, that "people do not know when a thing is proved;" but if my reader be candid, he will confess that I have established several things.

1. I have shown that the Episcopal Church has brought out from Rome, and perpetuates, doctrines and practices repugnant to Scripture and reason. 2. I have proved that the Episcopal Church has subverted the form of government established by Jesus Christ and the Apostles. 3. It is clear that she has erected a new and unscriptural order in the Ministry.

And now, if this be so, for me to be an Episcopalian, would be to lend my influence and contributions to support these abuses, and not only these but others growing out of them.

1. It would be to support those pretensions about Ordination, which are designed to magnify

the Prelates. Clarkson, himself an Episcopalian, says, "A Bishop, in the best ages of Christianity, was no other than the Pastor of a single Church. A Pastor of a single congregation is now as truly a Bishop. They were duly ordained in those ages, who were set apart for the work of the Ministry by the Pastor of a single Church, with the concurrence of some assistants. Why they should not be esteemed to be duly ordained, who are accordingly set apart by a Pastor of a single Church now, I can discern no reason, after I have looked every way for it. Let something be assigned which will make an essential difference herein ; otherwise they that judge such Ordinations here, and in other Reformed Churches, to be nullities, will hereby declare all the ordinations in the ancient Church for three or four hundred years, to be null and void, and must own the dismal consequences that ensue therefrom. They that will have no ordinations but such as are performed by one who has many Churches under him, maintain a novelty never known nor dreamt of in the ancient Churches, while their state was tolerable. They may as well say the ancient Church had never a Bishop, (if their interest

did not hinder—all the reason they make use of in this case would lead them to it,) as deny that a reformed Pastor has power to ordain, because he is not a Bishop. He has Episcopal ordination, even such as the canons require, being set apart by two or three Pastors at least, who are as truly diocesans as the ancient Bishops, for some whole ages.”(*h*)

2. And it would be to sustain the absurdity of Apostolical Succession; a theory which has been exposed frequently, and like Baptismal Regeneration, is with singular inconsistency renounced by many eminent Episcopalians, who yet act on the principle by excluding Ministers of other denominations from their pulpits. (*i*) A theory which is such a palpable fiction of Romanism that it would seem impossible for any candid Protestant to treat it with respect. “A theory,” says Macaulay, which is this, “that each Bishop, from the apostolic times, has received in his consecration a mysterious ‘gift,’ and also transmits to every Priest in his ordination a mysterious ‘gift,’ indicated in the respective offices, by the awful words, ‘Receive

(*h*) Prim. Episc., p. 183. (*i*) See Whately’s Kingdom of Christ, pp. 182–188.

the Holy Ghost;’ that on this the right of Priests to assume their function, and the preternatural grace of the sacraments administered by them, depends; that Bishops, once consecrated, instantly become a sort of Leyden jar of spiritual electricity, and are invested with the remarkable property of transmitting the ‘gift’ to others; that this has been the case from the primitive age till now; that this high gift has been incorruptibly transmitted through the hands of impure, profligate, heretical ecclesiastics, as ignorant and flagitious as any of their lay contemporaries; that, in fact, these ‘gifts’ are perfectly irrespective of the moral character and qualifications both of Bishop and Priest, and reside in equal integrity in a Bonner or in a Cranmer; a parson Adams or a parson Trulliber.” (j)

(j) Edin. Rev. Apr. 1843.

REASON VI.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH IS NOW IN EXISTENCE
WITH LEGITIMATE CLAIMS.

THERE are other and minor reasons why I cannot be an Episcopalian ; as for instance, the Romish observance of days, the formalities of worship, Priestly and Episcopal vestments, Rochets, Gowns and Surplices, and their changes, so unlike the simplicity of apostolic customs, the appellation “ Priest ” applied to Pastors, an abuse condemned by the New Testament, in which Christ is the only Priest, and which betrays its Romish origin by squinting hardly at the impieties of the mass.

These are with me, however, inferior matters, I therefore do not insist on them, but at once give my last reason why I am not an Episcopalian, which is, that I FIND THE CHURCH ORGANIZED BY THE APOSTLES NOW EXISTING, AND I HOLD IT MY BOUNDEN DUTY TO SUSTAIN IT.

1. The apostolic Churches consisted of baptized believers. “ Then *they that gladly re-*

ceived his word were baptized: and the same day there were *added unto them* about three thousand souls." (*k*) This is said to be "adding to the Church,"—"And the Lord *added to the Church* daily such as should be saved." (*l*) "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women;" (*m*) "But *when they believed* Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, *they were baptized* both men and women." (*n*)

I do not here design to enter into the baptismal controversy. God certainly cannot have given a command which is difficult to comprehend; and, though volumes have been written and thus embarrassed the Scriptures, if my reader will consult the New Testament, he will, I conceive, agree with the author of Lacon, that "were a plain man to read the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles without note or comment, it would never enter into his heart to conceive the purport of many ideas signified by words ending in *ism*, which nevertheless have cost Christendom rivers of ink and oceans

(*k*) Acts ii. 41. (*l*) Acts ii. 47. (*m*) Acts v. 14. (*n*) Acts viii. 12.

of blood." I shall only submit a thought or two.

1. Does not the very commission shut out the idea of infant baptism? "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized," &c. Now let it never be forgotten that this is *the only authority under which any one can baptize*, and I inquire candidly, Does this authorize the baptism of any but believers? Open any Pedobaptist work addressed to parents, and how certainly do you find them exhorted "to bring their children to the font" with a great deal about "covenant mercies," &c. Is it (I do not say probable, but) *possible* that in the Bible designed for all ages and for *Pagans* as well as *Jews*, there should be such minute addresses as to the duty of parents to their children, and yet not one word, not one instance, supporting infant baptism? The only plausible argument I ever saw for the practice is from the Abrahamic covenant of Circumcision; but,

2. Is it not an ample refutation of this plea, that the Abrahamic rite was restricted to one sex, and extended to all servants bought by a Jew without reference to age or character?

Would any one now so restrict baptism? Would any one so extend it, and baptize the slaves bought by a master simply *on the ground that they were his servants*, and although they were notoriously wicked? If not, then the Jewish Congregation into which persons were admitted by circumcision, was not a body like the Christian Church into which baptism initiates.

(3.) Moreover, even if the argument from the Abrahamic covenant of Circumcision holds, still children ought to be circumcised, not baptized. Baptism has not come in the room of circumcision. Both are positive institutions; and the substitution of one for the other requires, therefore, a positive order. But, what is demonstratively conclusive here, is, *that the Jewish converts continued in the Apostles' days to circumcise their children*. This rite belonged to them as Jews, and they, therefore, did not discontinue it. In Acts ch. xxi. 21, we find that when Paul came to Rome, the Jewish converts alleged as a criminal charge against him, that he had taught the Jews who were among the Gentiles, "not to circumcise their children." Now could this charge have been made, if circumcision had been supplanted by

baptism? And would not Paul at once have said, "Yes, I have so taught, because baptism is come in the place of circumcision?" Instead of this, he plainly treats the charge as a slander, and takes measures to refute it. "And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord; and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law: *And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.* What is it, therefore? The multitudes must needs come together, for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know, that those things, *whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law.** As touching the Gentiles which

* In Acts xvi. we read that he circumcised Timothy, who was a Jew by the mother's side, sometime after he

believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing.” (o) In Acts xv., we find that some Jewish converts taught even the Gentiles that they should be circumcised; and this occasioned great discussion, and caused the consultation of the Apostles. Could this difference of opinion have existed, if God had taught the Apostles that baptism was in the room of circumcision, and would not the Council of Apostles have said so? But they evidently were of a different opinion, and decided that

was baptized. He would not, however, allow the rite to Titus, who was a Greek.—Galat. ii. 3. The dissimulation of Peter and Barnabas and other Hebrews, (Galat. ii. 12, 13; 14, will satisfy any one, that the thought of baptism as a substitute for circumcision, was unheard of in the Apostles’ days. Peter and his companions lived in intimacy with the baptized Gentiles for some time; but when certain Jewish Christians arrived, they withdrew and “separated themselves, fearing them which were of the Circumcision.” This was unworthy timidity and duplicity, since Peter knew that in the Christian Church there was no difference between Gentile and Jew. It proves, however, not only that circumcision was still practiced, but so highly esteemed by Jewish converts, that an Apostle shrank from the odium to which he had exposed himself, by associating on a footing of equality, with those who had not this mark, *although they were baptized.*

(o) Acts xxi. 20–25.

(while the Jewish converts ought to continue the Abrahamic rite) it was not required of the Gentiles. Neander, the ablest writer of Church History who ever lived, and not a Baptist, says: "How could he (Paul,) have set up infant baptism against the circumcision that continued to be practised by the Jewish Christians? In this case, the dispute carried on with the Judaizing party, on the necessity of circumcision, would easily have given an opportunity of introducing this substitute into the controversy, if it had really existed." (*p*) That in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Paul declares the Mosaic ceremonies abolished, has nothing to do with this matter, for the Mosaic ritual was not the Abrahamic covenant.

2. The *baptism of the New Testament is immersion*. On this point, the learned Bossuet, a Roman Catholic, says: "John's baptism was performed by plunging. In fine, we read not in the Scripture, that baptism was otherwise administered; and we are able to make it appear by the acts of councils, and by the ancient rituals, that for thirteen hundred

(*p*) See Plant. of Ch. p. 102.—See this whole masterly argument as to the subjects and mode of baptism, in which his learning and intellect are only surpassed by his candor.

years, baptism was thus administered throughout the whole Church as far as was possible."

The truth is, the word means "*immerse*," and *nothing else*, as the reader will see by consulting any good Lexicon. That it is sometimes figuratively used, to convey the idea of steeping in an abundance of any element, is admitted. Such instances are found in Greek poetry; and in the Bible, Christians are said to be "*baptized in the Holy Ghost*," (*q*) intimating, in strong eastern style, their being wholly surrounded and imbued with his influences. But in these cases the very force of the metaphor is derived from this that the proper import of the phrase is immerse. The English terms "plunge" and "dip" are employed in the same way. Thus we say "*Plunged in grief*;" Milton says (in *Comus*)

———"a cold shuddering dew
Dips me all o'er."

And Shakspeare says (in *Hamlet*)

"What would he do,
Had he the motive and the cue for passion
That I have? He would *drown* the stage with tears."

(*q*) Such is the original; in every case the Greek is "baptize *in* water" "*in* the Holy Ghost," not "with."

All feel, however, that, in examining the meaning of a law, it is trifling to go to poets and their metaphors. I shall, therefore, not argue this matter, but simply submit to the reader, whether he can have any sort of doubt what baptism is, with the plain declarations of God's word before him? Take this passage—"Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized went up straightway *out of the water.*"(r) Take this, "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the Eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said; *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayst.* And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both *into the water*, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they

(r) Matt. iii. 13, 14, 15, 16.

were come up *out of the water*, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the Eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing.” (s) Take this, “And John also was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was *much water* there;” (t) And not to multiply passages, take this, “Know ye not, that so *many of us as were baptized* into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are *buried with him by baptism* into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been *planted* together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” (u) Now, I enquire, are these passages (translated, too, by Episcopalians,) doubtful? Every respectable commentator confesses the last quotation wholly without meaning, unless the word signifies immerse.

Doddridge, (Independent,) “‘Buried with him in baptism.’ It seems the part of candor to confess, that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by immersion.”

(s) Acts viii. 36, 37, 38, 39. (t) John iii. 23. (u) Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5.

John Wesley, (Methodist,) “ ‘Buried with him,’ alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.”

Whitby, (Episcopalian,) author of a Commentary on the New Testament, and more than forty other learned works. “It being so expressly declared here, Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12, that we are buried with Christ in baptism, by being buried under water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to sin, being taken hence; and this immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries, and approved by our Church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the author of this institution, or any license from any council of the Church, being that which the Romanist still urges to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old in case of the Clinici, or in present danger of death.”

Dr. Chalmers, on this text, says, “The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion, and though we regard it as a point of indifferency, whether the ordinance so named be

performed in this way or by sprinkling, yet we doubt not that the prevalent style of administration in the Apostle's days, was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water."(*v*)

Archbishop Tillotson : "Anciently those who were baptized were immersed and buried in water, to represent their death to sin; and then did rise up out of the water, to signify their entrance upon a new life."(*w*)

Indeed, only adopt any other signification, say '*poured*,' and how will it read? "Know ye not that so many of us as were *poured* into Jesus Christ were *poured* into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by *pouring* into death!" Or let us try "*sprinkled*." "Know ye not that so many of us as were *sprinkled* into Jesus Christ, were *sprinkled* into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by *sprinkling* into death!" It is certain, then, this verse requires immersion; but note, the Apostle here declares *that all who are baptized are so buried*.

3. Lastly, the popular form of government; the simplicity of worship; the orders of Presbyter (called Pastor or Bishop when having

charge of a Church,) and Deacon, (an officer having supervision of the temporal concerns of the Church,) I find in that body to which I belong. And, while I love many who differ from me, and respect most devoutly their right of private judgment, yet, as I love Christ more, and am soon to answer to him, I dare not throw my little influence in favor of any other Church, and in opposition to that which I believe is striving to preserve in all things, the doctrines and usages embodied in the Scriptures.

These remarks, reader, I now leave with you, praying that God will lead, and guide, and bless you for Jesus' sake; and entreating you to remember the admonitions, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." (x) "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." (y) Jesus Christ "being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (z)

(x) John xv. 14. (y) Matt. vii. 21. (z) Heb. v. 9.

VALUABLE BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY THE

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

118 ARCH STREET,

PHILADELPHIA.

COMPLETE WORKS OF ANDREW FULLER.

THREE VOLUMES, OCTAVO.

The complete Works of the Rev. Andrew Fuller; with a Memoir of the author, and a likeness. Price \$6 00 in cloth or sheep; \$6 50 in half calf or turkey morocco.

“ Fuller’s Works might, without any very remarkable impropriety, be designated an Encyclopedia of Polemic, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology. With giant steps he traverses the whole empire of revelation, and of reason as its handmaid. He is the Bacon of Scripture. It is a Library in itself. The Bible and these Works will suffice to make any man a first rate theologian.”—*Rev. Dr. Campbell in the London Christian Witness.*

BAPTISM IN ITS MODE AND SUBJECTS.

BY ALEXANDER CARSON.

This work contains a brief Memoir of the author, with his reply to Rev. Dr. Miller, &c. One octavo volume of 550 pages. Price \$1 50 in sheep or cloth; \$1 60 in half calf or half turkey morocco.

“ Let those who think that the solemn immersion of believers in water is not baptism, answer, IF THEY CAN, fairly and without evasion, the learned, candid, and decisive work of Mr. Carson.”—*Rev. B. H. Draper, LL. D.*

HISTORY OF BAPTISM.

BY ISAAC T HINTON.

A History of Baptism, from inspired and uninspired writings. This is a beautiful edition, from new stereotype plates. It has also been published in England. 12mo. 348 pages. Price 65 cents in cloth or sheep.

FREY'S SCRIPTURE TYPES.

THE SCRIPTURE TYPES. A course of Lectures by Joseph Samuel C. F. Frey. A new edition, in two volumes. Vol. I. contains 306 pages; Vol. II. 320 pages. Price, 50 cents per volume. Also, in one volume, for \$1.00, in cloth, sheep, or half-calf.

"The peculiar circumstances of the author, as a natural descendant of Abraham; he having sustained, for a number of years, the office of a Jewish Rabbi, for which he had been regularly educated; gave him an opportunity of obtaining a superior knowledge of the Mosaic dispensation, and of the Jewish ceremonies and customs, both ancient and modern, thus enabling him to embody in these Lectures much valuable information. This work should be found in the Libraries of Bible Classes and Sunday Schools."—*Spencer H. Cone, D. D.*

"Having carefully read this work of Rev. C. F. Frey, I do very cordially unite in recommending it as one of much value. It is, though abounding in information, highly devotional and practical in its character."—*William R. Williams, D. D.*

THE BAPTIST HARP.

THE BAPTIST HARP: a new collection of Hymns for the Closet, the Family, Social Worship and Revivals. It contains 583 Hymns and 5 Doxologies. Two sets of stereotype plates have been prepared, large and small. The pocket edition is only 25 cents. The medium size (printed from the same plates, but with a wide margin,) 30 cents. The large edition, 35 cents. Various styles of ornamental binding, according to price, from 35 cents to \$2.00.

"We hesitate not to say that in some important respects, we must give it a decided preference to any volume of the kind we have ever yet seen."—*Christian Review, Boston, Mass.*

"We are willing to pronounce it unsurpassed, nay unequalled."—*Southern Baptist, Charleston, S. C.*

INFANT BAPTISM.

The Scriptural and Historical Arguments for Infant Baptism examined; by J. Torrey Smith, A. M. An able work on the Covenant of Circumcision, with a review of the New Testament Arguments, and thorough examination of the Historical Evidence derived from the Christian writers of the first five centuries. 25 cts.

COMMUNION.

BY T. F. CURTIS.

Communion; or the Distinction between Christian and Church Fellowship, and between Communion and its Symbols, embracing a review of the arguments of Rev. Robert Hall, and Rev. Baptist W. Noel in favor of mixed communion. A work logical in argument, calm in tone, elegant in style, devout in spirit, and deeply imbued with the mind of Christ. 12mo. 75 cts.

THE DEACONSHIP.

THE DEACONSHIP, by Robert B. C. Howell, D. D. In nine chapters the author shows the origin and nature of the Deacon's office, the qualifications for the office, &c. 154 pages, 18mo. Price, 30 cents.

THE BAPTIST MANUAL.

A Selection of Doctrinal and Practical Tracts, exhibiting the sentiments and practices of the denomination. 12mo., 384 pages. 50 cents.

CLOSING SCENES.

Closing Scenes, or Death Beds of Young Persons. A book abounding in narratives of thrilling interest. 194 pages, 18 mo. Price, 25 cents, in half-binding; 30 cents, in cloth.

BAXTER'S SAINTS' REST

A beautiful edition; bound in cloth. 444 pages. 40 cts.

BAXTER'S CALL.

Baxter's Call to the Unconverted. 18mo. 177 pages. 15 cents.

PIKE'S GUIDE TO YOUNG DISCIPLES.

An excellent work for Young Converts. 465 pages. 40 cents.

BAPTIST FAMILY LIBRARY.

In six volumes, in uniform binding. Price \$3.75.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Hinton's History of Baptism. | 4. Bunyan's Holy War |
| 2. Howell on Communion. | 5. Baptist Manual. |
| 3. Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. | 6. Booth's Reign of Grace. |

SUNDAY SCHOOL BOOKS.

The Society has issued many interesting volumes for Sunday School Libraries. The publications of the American Sunday School Union, and of the American Tract Society are also kept for sale.

THE TERMS OF COMMUNION.

BY ROBERT B. C. HOWELL.

A beautiful edition from new stereotype plates, and the price reduced to 60 cents. Its wide circulation in this country, and its republication in England, are the best testimonials of its usefulness.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS.

BY JOHN BUNYAN.

This edition contains a likeness of the author and four engravings. Price 60 cents.

THE HOLY WAR.

BY JOHN BUNYAN.

A new edition with six engravings. Price 60 cents.

"One of the greatest books ever made."—*Albert Barnes.*

MARRIED LIFE.—A WEDDING GIFT.

BY JOSEPH BELCHER.

An elegant miniature volume of 128 pages, with gilt edges and ornamental covers. Price 30 cents.

SCRIPTURE GUIDE TO BAPTISM.

BY R. PENGILLY.

The many thousands of this able work which have been sold attest its excellence. It contains 90 pages Price 25 cents in cloth, and 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ in paper covers.

PENGILLY'S GUIDE AND BOOTH'S VINDICATION.

This volume contains two treatises. First, Pengilly's Scripture Guide to Baptism. Second, Booth's Vindication of the Baptists from the charge of bigotry, in refusing communion at the Lord's table to Pædobaptists. Price, 25 cents in cloth, and 20 cents in half binding.

SACRIFICE AND ATONEMENT.

BY SAMUEL W. LYND.

One volume, 12 mo. 231 pages. Price 60 cents.

TRACTS.

One hundred and seventy-one Tracts are published by the Society and sold at the rate of 15 pages for a cent; 375 pages for 25 cents; 1500 pages for one dollar.

